



TUESDAY MORNING, JAN. 21, 1882.

THE ATTACK ON THE NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANT.

It is plain that the attack on the Northern Pacific land grant is directly inspired by the managers of the other transcontinental roads, who don't want a rival and are anxious to do all in their power to obstruct, hinder and delay a competing railroad. Here is the main source of attack, though allies are found in other quarters. For example, an effort is being made to fasten upon Mr. Schurz the charge of having mismanaged the public domain while he was secretary of the interior; and his personal enemies join in the attack upon the Northern Pacific land grant to make a point against him. Again, the Chicago Tribune has a dispatch which asserts that Mr. Cyrus W. Field, president of the New York Mail and Express, has resolved to make the effort a personal and desperate one, out of hostility to Mr. Schurz, because he is part owner and editor of the Evening Post, a rival newspaper in New York; and that activated by this purpose Mr. Field has directed the Washington agents of his paper to go ahead, regardless of expense, and show up what are termed the Northern Pacific land frauds. It is said that lawyers and correspondents have been employed to write up the old history of the Northern Pacific grant, and to review the alleged fraudulent acts of Mr. Schurz, whereby the Northern Pacific, though not completed within the time named in its charter, nevertheless is enabled to secure the lands as the road is built. Many attempts have heretofore been made to get an affirmative act of congress declaring the lands forfeited. These have all failed; and now there is a combination of those politically and personally opposed to Mr. Schurz and the enemies of the Northern Pacific company "to disgrace the one," as the Tribune's dispatch puts it, "and to injure the other." Of this phase of the case that paper says editorially: "Some people are mean spirited enough to trace a connection between the decision made by Mr. Schurz, while secretary of the interior, which was favorable to the Northern Pacific railroad land grant, and that gentleman's present position as editor of the New York Evening Post, of which Mr. Villard, (who now controls the Northern Pacific) is said to be part owner. As a matter of fact, the conditions have no possible relation. At the time Mr. Schurz made the decision in question, Mr. Villard was not interested in Northern Pacific, but on the contrary, as the head of the Oregon Navigation Company represented at that time a rival interest. Mr. Villard's connection with Northern Pacific first dates from at least one year after Mr. Schurz as secretary made the Northern Pacific decision, which, moreover, was based upon the opinion of the attorney-general as to the law of the case. The present relations of Messrs. Schurz and Villard, whatever they may be, evidently have nothing in common with the Northern Pacific decision, which is now attacked by interests antagonistic to the Northern Pacific railway.

Mr. Schurz himself meets the criticisms from all quarters against his official decision. In an article in the Evening Post that he proves that it was based on ample authority. He shows that as usual in such cases, he took the legal advice of the attorney general of the United States before deciding the case, and that he acted upon such advice. The decision was made in 1870. It was not a secret matter, but it had been known for over two years by all who care to know it. Since the decision was promulgated, congress has had two regular sessions, the one of 1870-71, and the session of 1880-81. If congress considered the decision wrong, it had ample time to overrule it and to take such action as it saw fit, but congress permitted the decision to stand unchallenged and to be acted upon. The committee of the house of representatives distinctly concurred in it as late as March, 1881. After the accession of President Arthur, the question came up again upon an application of the company to have certain sections of newly-built road inspected and accepted. Land patent issued accordingly. The master was again invited to the department of justice, which, after mature consideration and in full accord with Secretary Kirkwood, again gave an opinion affirming the decision in question, whereupon President Arthur ordered the new section of the road inspected, and accepted. There were several other cases before the department of land grants, that had failed to comply with their conditions, and they were all rejected. It had to be, whether the section in question was in accordance with the well known decision of the supreme court of the United States, stated in the case of Schenck v. Harlan, that a land grant was not forfeited, and that the forfeiture should be expressly declared by congress or upon proper proceedings by the attorney general of the United States in the courts. This decision was rendered by Justice Miller, and fully sustains the ruling of the department of justice and of the interior.

A dispatch from Washington to the St. Paul Pioneer-Press asserts that the movement is made in the interest of the Union and Central Pacific roads, which want to maintain their transcontinental monopoly. Mr. Teller, of Colorado, who introduced the resolution of inquiry in the senate, is said to be the counsel for the Union Pacific, and Representative Cassidy, of Nevada, who is fathering the matter in the house, is under the care of the counsel for the Central Pacific. The project to take away these Northern Pacific lands has a large lobby in its favor. There is a combination of land attorneys pushing for a forfeiture similar to that which engineered the arrest of the pensioners act through congress. These men are looking after their own profit. They want to procure the agency to get charters for settlers on the lands which they shall have been declared forfeited. It is the first step in their game to arouse a feeling among Mr. Schurz, Friends of the Northern Pacific say that behind these efforts to secure a forfeiture there is also a purpose to make the company pay them to litigate.

In its editorial comments, the Pioneer-Press says: "The regular annual raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant had begun rather earlier than usual this season. The lobby of strikers, representatives of rival roads and land grabbers, which has regularly taken charge of this matter, seems to have received mysterious reinforcements from some quarter, and to be stronger than ever. There is no use of threshing old straw to prove that the Northern Pacific land grant did not lapse with the expiration of the time fixed by law for the completion of the road. The supreme court decided this point, and that the grant did not lapse until resumed by a specific act of congress. To obtain such a specific act is probably the ultimate object of those who are now agitating the matter, and they are probably raising this cry of corruption to conceal their real motives and objects. Those are obscure and various. The crowd engaged in the raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant is a grand combination, a partially masked mass of lobby rings. The Union Pacific people, who want to embarrass a rival and come in for a share of the grant themselves by

whose incompatibility of temper happens to be in Paris, who the laws in that city furnish. Mr. Schurz is the most frank, of men that concern him, but he gives a great deal of charity.

The telegraphic report of the German press speaks of Mr. Schurz's masterly eloquence, of the lawyer's masterly eloquence, of the qualities of others of the lawyers, but eloquently fails to find passage. One speech, however, has been communicated and that, probably, will be carried beyond the power of congress or lobby to resume it in a year or two.

Nothing could better illustrate the ignorance of the author of the new Chinese bill than his personal enemies join in the attack upon the Northern Pacific land grant to make a point against him. Again, the Chicago Tribune has a dispatch which asserts that Mr. Cyrus W. Field, president of the New York Mail and Express, has resolved to make the effort a personal and desperate one, out of hostility to Mr. Schurz, because he is part owner and editor of the Evening Post, a rival newspaper in New York; and that activated by this purpose Mr. Field has directed the Washington agents of his paper to go ahead, regardless of expense, and show up what are termed the Northern Pacific land frauds. It is said that lawyers and correspondents have been employed to write up the old history of the Northern Pacific grant, and to review the alleged fraudulent acts of Mr. Schurz, whereby the Northern Pacific, though not completed within the time named in its charter, nevertheless is enabled to secure the lands as the road is built. Many attempts have heretofore been made to get an affirmative act of congress declaring the lands forfeited.

These have all failed; and now there is a combination of those politically and personally opposed to Mr. Schurz and the enemies of the Northern Pacific company "to disgrace the one," as the Tribune's dispatch puts it, "and to injure the other." Of this phase of the case that paper says editorially: "Some people are mean spirited enough to trace a connection between the decision made by Mr. Schurz, while secretary of the interior, which was favorable to the Northern Pacific railroad land grant, and that gentleman's present position as editor of the New York Evening Post, of which Mr. Villard, (who now controls the Northern Pacific) is said to be part owner. As a matter of fact, the conditions have no possible relation. At the time Mr. Schurz made the decision in question, Mr. Villard was not interested in Northern Pacific, but on the contrary, as the head of the Oregon Navigation Company represented at that time a rival interest. Mr. Villard's connection with Northern Pacific first dates from at least one year after Mr. Schurz as secretary made the Northern Pacific decision, which, moreover, was based upon the opinion of the attorney-general as to the law of the case. The present relations of Messrs. Schurz and Villard, whatever they may be, evidently have nothing in common with the Northern Pacific decision, which is now attacked by interests antagonistic to the Northern Pacific railway.

Mr. Schurz himself meets the criticisms from all quarters against his official decision. In an article in the Evening Post that he proves that it was based on ample authority. He shows that as usual in such cases, he took the legal advice of the attorney general of the United States before deciding the case, and that he acted upon such advice. The decision was made in 1870. It was not a secret matter, but it had been known for over two years by all who care to know it. Since the decision was promulgated, congress has had two regular sessions, the one of 1870-71, and the session of 1880-81. If congress considered the decision wrong, it had ample time to overrule it and to take such action as it saw fit, but congress permitted the decision to stand unchallenged and to be acted upon. The committee of the house of representatives distinctly concurred in it as late as March, 1881. After the accession of President Arthur, the question came up again upon an application of the company to have certain sections of newly-built road inspected and accepted. Land patent issued accordingly. The master was again invited to the department of justice, which, after mature consideration and in full accord with Secretary Kirkwood, again gave an opinion affirming the decision in question, whereupon President Arthur ordered the new section of the road inspected, and accepted. There were several other cases before the department of land grants, that had failed to comply with their conditions, and they were all rejected. It had to be, whether the section in question was in accordance with the well known decision of the supreme court of the United States, stated in the case of Schenck v. Harlan, that a land grant was not forfeited, and that the forfeiture should be expressly declared by congress or upon proper proceedings by the attorney general of the United States in the courts. This decision was rendered by Justice Miller, and fully sustains the ruling of the department of justice and of the interior.

A dispatch from Washington to the St. Paul Pioneer-Press asserts that the movement is made in the interest of the Union and Central Pacific roads, which want to maintain their transcontinental monopoly. Mr. Teller, of Colorado, who introduced the resolution of inquiry in the senate, is said to be the counsel for the Union Pacific, and Representative Cassidy, of Nevada, who is fathering the matter in the house, is under the care of the counsel for the Central Pacific. The project to take away these Northern Pacific lands has a large lobby in its favor. There is a combination of land attorneys pushing for a forfeiture similar to that which engineered the arrest of the pensioners act through congress. These men are looking after their own profit. They want to procure the agency to get charters for settlers on the lands which they shall have been declared forfeited. It is the first step in their game to arouse a feeling among Mr. Schurz, Friends of the Northern Pacific say that behind these efforts to secure a forfeiture there is also a purpose to make the company pay them to litigate.

In its editorial comments, the Pioneer-Press says: "The regular annual raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant had begun rather earlier than usual this season. The lobby of strikers, representatives of rival roads and land grabbers, which has regularly taken charge of this matter, seems to have received mysterious reinforcements from some quarter, and to be stronger than ever. There is no use of threshing old straw to prove that the Northern Pacific land grant did not lapse with the expiration of the time fixed by law for the completion of the road. The supreme court decided this point, and that the grant did not lapse until resumed by a specific act of congress. To obtain such a specific act is probably the ultimate object of those who are now agitating the matter, and they are probably raising this cry of corruption to conceal their real motives and objects. Those are obscure and various. The crowd engaged in the raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant is a grand combination, a partially masked mass of lobby rings. The Union Pacific people, who want to embarrass a rival and come in for a share of the grant themselves by

whose incompatibility of temper happens to be in Paris, who the laws in that city furnish. Mr. Schurz is the most frank, of men that concern him, but he gives a great deal of charity.

The telegraphic report of the German press speaks of Mr. Schurz's masterly eloquence, of the lawyer's masterly eloquence, of the qualities of others of the lawyers, but eloquently fails to find passage. One speech, however, has been communicated and that, probably, will be carried beyond the power of congress or lobby to resume it in a year or two.

Nothing could better illustrate the ignorance of the author of the new Chinese bill than his personal enemies join in the attack upon the Northern Pacific land grant to make a point against him. Again, the Chicago Tribune has a dispatch which asserts that Mr. Cyrus W. Field, president of the New York Mail and Express, has resolved to make the effort a personal and desperate one, out of hostility to Mr. Schurz, because he is part owner and editor of the Evening Post, a rival newspaper in New York; and that activated by this purpose Mr. Field has directed the Washington agents of his paper to go ahead, regardless of expense, and show up what are termed the Northern Pacific land frauds. It is said that lawyers and correspondents have been employed to write up the old history of the Northern Pacific grant, and to review the alleged fraudulent acts of Mr. Schurz, whereby the Northern Pacific, though not completed within the time named in its charter, nevertheless is enabled to secure the lands as the road is built. Many attempts have heretofore been made to get an affirmative act of congress declaring the lands forfeited.

These have all failed; and now there is a combination of those politically and personally opposed to Mr. Schurz and the enemies of the Northern Pacific company "to disgrace the one," as the Tribune's dispatch puts it, "and to injure the other." Of this phase of the case that paper says editorially: "Some people are mean spirited enough to trace a connection between the decision made by Mr. Schurz, while secretary of the interior, which was favorable to the Northern Pacific railroad land grant, and that gentleman's present position as editor of the New York Evening Post, of which Mr. Villard, (who now controls the Northern Pacific) is said to be part owner. As a matter of fact, the conditions have no possible relation. At the time Mr. Schurz made the decision in question, Mr. Villard was not interested in Northern Pacific, but on the contrary, as the head of the Oregon Navigation Company represented at that time a rival interest. Mr. Villard's connection with Northern Pacific first dates from at least one year after Mr. Schurz as secretary made the Northern Pacific decision, which, moreover, was based upon the opinion of the attorney-general as to the law of the case. The present relations of Messrs. Schurz and Villard, whatever they may be, evidently have nothing in common with the Northern Pacific decision, which is now attacked by interests antagonistic to the Northern Pacific railway.

Mr. Schurz himself meets the criticisms from all quarters against his official decision. In an article in the Evening Post that he proves that it was based on ample authority. He shows that as usual in such cases, he took the legal advice of the attorney general of the United States before deciding the case, and that he acted upon such advice. The decision was made in 1870. It was not a secret matter, but it had been known for over two years by all who care to know it. Since the decision was promulgated, congress has had two regular sessions, the one of 1870-71, and the session of 1880-81. If congress considered the decision wrong, it had ample time to overrule it and to take such action as it saw fit, but congress permitted the decision to stand unchallenged and to be acted upon. The committee of the house of representatives distinctly concurred in it as late as March, 1881. After the accession of President Arthur, the question came up again upon an application of the company to have certain sections of newly-built road inspected and accepted. Land patent issued accordingly. The master was again invited to the department of justice, which, after mature consideration and in full accord with Secretary Kirkwood, again gave an opinion affirming the decision in question, whereupon President Arthur ordered the new section of the road inspected, and accepted. There were several other cases before the department of land grants, that had failed to comply with their conditions, and they were all rejected. It had to be, whether the section in question was in accordance with the well known decision of the supreme court of the United States, stated in the case of Schenck v. Harlan, that a land grant was not forfeited, and that the forfeiture should be expressly declared by congress or upon proper proceedings by the attorney general of the United States in the courts. This decision was rendered by Justice Miller, and fully sustains the ruling of the department of justice and of the interior.

A dispatch from Washington to the St. Paul Pioneer-Press asserts that the movement is made in the interest of the Union and Central Pacific roads, which want to maintain their transcontinental monopoly. Mr. Teller, of Colorado, who introduced the resolution of inquiry in the senate, is said to be the counsel for the Union Pacific, and Representative Cassidy, of Nevada, who is fathering the matter in the house, is under the care of the counsel for the Central Pacific. The project to take away these Northern Pacific lands has a large lobby in its favor. There is a combination of land attorneys pushing for a forfeiture similar to that which engineered the arrest of the pensioners act through congress. These men are looking after their own profit. They want to procure the agency to get charters for settlers on the lands which they shall have been declared forfeited. It is the first step in their game to arouse a feeling among Mr. Schurz, Friends of the Northern Pacific say that behind these efforts to secure a forfeiture there is also a purpose to make the company pay them to litigate.

In its editorial comments, the Pioneer-Press says: "The regular annual raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant had begun rather earlier than usual this season. The lobby of strikers, representatives of rival roads and land grabbers, which has regularly taken charge of this matter, seems to have received mysterious reinforcements from some quarter, and to be stronger than ever. There is no use of threshing old straw to prove that the Northern Pacific land grant did not lapse with the expiration of the time fixed by law for the completion of the road. The supreme court decided this point, and that the grant did not lapse until resumed by a specific act of congress. To obtain such a specific act is probably the ultimate object of those who are now agitating the matter, and they are probably raising this cry of corruption to conceal their real motives and objects. Those are obscure and various. The crowd engaged in the raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant is a grand combination, a partially masked mass of lobby rings. The Union Pacific people, who want to embarrass a rival and come in for a share of the grant themselves by

whose incompatibility of temper happens to be in Paris, who the laws in that city furnish. Mr. Schurz is the most frank, of men that concern him, but he gives a great deal of charity.

The telegraphic report of the German press speaks of Mr. Schurz's masterly eloquence, of the lawyer's masterly eloquence, of the qualities of others of the lawyers, but eloquently fails to find passage. One speech, however, has been communicated and that, probably, will be carried beyond the power of congress or lobby to resume it in a year or two.

Nothing could better illustrate the ignorance of the author of the new Chinese bill than his personal enemies join in the attack upon the Northern Pacific land grant to make a point against him. Again, the Chicago Tribune has a dispatch which asserts that Mr. Cyrus W. Field, president of the New York Mail and Express, has resolved to make the effort a personal and desperate one, out of hostility to Mr. Schurz, because he is part owner and editor of the Evening Post, a rival newspaper in New York; and that activated by this purpose Mr. Field has directed the Washington agents of his paper to go ahead, regardless of expense, and show up what are termed the Northern Pacific land frauds. It is said that lawyers and correspondents have been employed to write up the old history of the Northern Pacific grant, and to review the alleged fraudulent acts of Mr. Schurz, whereby the Northern Pacific, though not completed within the time named in its charter, nevertheless is enabled to secure the lands as the road is built. Many attempts have heretofore been made to get an affirmative act of congress declaring the lands forfeited.

These have all failed; and now there is a combination of those politically and personally opposed to Mr. Schurz and the enemies of the Northern Pacific company "to disgrace the one," as the Tribune's dispatch puts it, "and to injure the other." Of this phase of the case that paper says editorially: "Some people are mean spirited enough to trace a connection between the decision made by Mr. Schurz, while secretary of the interior, which was favorable to the Northern Pacific railroad land grant, and that gentleman's present position as editor of the New York Evening Post, of which Mr. Villard, (who now controls the Northern Pacific) is said to be part owner. As a matter of fact, the conditions have no possible relation. At the time Mr. Schurz made the decision in question, Mr. Villard was not interested in Northern Pacific, but on the contrary, as the head of the Oregon Navigation Company represented at that time a rival interest. Mr. Villard's connection with Northern Pacific first dates from at least one year after Mr. Schurz as secretary made the Northern Pacific decision, which, moreover, was based upon the opinion of the attorney-general as to the law of the case. The present relations of Messrs. Schurz and Villard, whatever they may be, evidently have nothing in common with the Northern Pacific decision, which is now attacked by interests antagonistic to the Northern Pacific railway.

Mr. Schurz himself meets the criticisms from all quarters against his official decision. In an article in the Evening Post that he proves that it was based on ample authority. He shows that as usual in such cases, he took the legal advice of the attorney general of the United States before deciding the case, and that he acted upon such advice. The decision was made in 1870. It was not a secret matter, but it had been known for over two years by all who care to know it. Since the decision was promulgated, congress has had two regular sessions, the one of 1870-71, and the session of 1880-81. If congress considered the decision wrong, it had ample time to overrule it and to take such action as it saw fit, but congress permitted the decision to stand unchallenged and to be acted upon. The committee of the house of representatives distinctly concurred in it as late as March, 1881. After the accession of President Arthur, the question came up again upon an application of the company to have certain sections of newly-built road inspected and accepted. Land patent issued accordingly. The master was again invited to the department of justice, which, after mature consideration and in full accord with Secretary Kirkwood, again gave an opinion affirming the decision in question, whereupon President Arthur ordered the new section of the road inspected, and accepted. There were several other cases before the department of land grants, that had failed to comply with their conditions, and they were all rejected. It had to be, whether the section in question was in accordance with the well known decision of the supreme court of the United States, stated in the case of Schenck v. Harlan, that a land grant was not forfeited, and that the forfeiture should be expressly declared by congress or upon proper proceedings by the attorney general of the United States in the courts. This decision was rendered by Justice Miller, and fully sustains the ruling of the department of justice and of the interior.

A dispatch from Washington to the St. Paul Pioneer-Press asserts that the movement is made in the interest of the Union and Central Pacific roads, which want to maintain their transcontinental monopoly. Mr. Teller, of Colorado, who introduced the resolution of inquiry in the senate, is said to be the counsel for the Union Pacific, and Representative Cassidy, of Nevada, who is fathering the matter in the house, is under the care of the counsel for the Central Pacific. The project to take away these Northern Pacific lands has a large lobby in its favor. There is a combination of land attorneys pushing for a forfeiture similar to that which engineered the arrest of the pensioners act through congress. These men are looking after their own profit. They want to procure the agency to get charters for settlers on the lands which they shall have been declared forfeited. It is the first step in their game to arouse a feeling among Mr. Schurz, Friends of the Northern Pacific say that behind these efforts to secure a forfeiture there is also a purpose to make the company pay them to litigate.

In its editorial comments, the Pioneer-Press says: "The regular annual raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant had begun rather earlier than usual this season. The lobby of strikers, representatives of rival roads and land grabbers, which has regularly taken charge of this matter, seems to have received mysterious reinforcements from some quarter, and to be stronger than ever. There is no use of threshing old straw to prove that the Northern Pacific land grant did not lapse with the expiration of the time fixed by law for the completion of the road. The supreme court decided this point, and that the grant did not lapse until resumed by a specific act of congress. To obtain such a specific act is probably the ultimate object of those who are now agitating the matter, and they are probably raising this cry of corruption to conceal their real motives and objects. Those are obscure and various. The crowd engaged in the raid upon the Northern Pacific land grant is a grand combination, a partially masked mass of lobby rings. The Union Pacific people, who want to embarrass a rival and come in for a share of the grant themselves by

whose incompatibility of temper happens to be in Paris, who the laws in that city furnish. Mr. Schurz is the most frank, of men that concern him, but he gives a great deal of charity.

The telegraphic report of the German press speaks of Mr. Schurz's masterly eloquence, of the lawyer's masterly eloquence, of the qualities of others of the lawyers, but eloquently fails to find passage. One speech, however, has been communicated and that, probably, will be carried beyond the power of congress or lobby to resume it in a year or two.

Nothing could better illustrate the ignorance of the author of the new Chinese bill than his personal enemies join in the attack upon the Northern Pacific land grant to make a point against him. Again, the Chicago Tribune has a dispatch which asserts that Mr. Cyrus W. Field, president of the New York Mail and Express, has resolved to make the effort a personal and desperate one, out of hostility to Mr. Schurz, because he is part owner and editor of the Evening Post, a rival newspaper in New York; and that activated by this purpose Mr. Field has directed the Washington agents of his paper to go ahead, regardless of expense, and show up what are termed the Northern Pacific land frauds. It is said that lawyers and correspondents have been employed to write up the old history of the Northern Pacific grant, and to review the alleged fraudulent acts of Mr. Schurz, whereby the Northern Pacific, though not completed within the time named in its charter, nevertheless is enabled to secure the lands as the road is built. Many attempts have heretofore been made to get an affirmative act of congress declaring the lands forfeited.

These have all failed; and now there is a combination of those politically and personally opposed to Mr. Schurz and the enemies of the Northern Pacific company "to disgrace the one," as the Tribune's dispatch puts it, "and to injure the other." Of this phase of the case that paper says editorially: "Some people are mean spirited enough to trace a connection between the decision made by Mr. Schurz, while secretary of the interior, which was favorable to the Northern Pacific railroad land grant, and that gentleman's present position as editor of the New York Evening Post, of which Mr. Villard, (who now controls the Northern Pacific) is said to be part owner. As a matter of fact, the conditions have no possible relation. At the time Mr. Schurz made the decision in question, Mr. Villard was not interested in Northern Pacific, but on the contrary, as the head of the Oregon Navigation Company represented at that time a rival interest. Mr. Villard's connection with Northern Pacific first dates from at least one year after Mr. Schurz as secretary made the Northern Pacific decision, which, moreover, was based upon the opinion of the attorney-general as to the law of the case. The present relations of Messrs. Schurz and Villard, whatever they may be, evidently have nothing in common with the Northern Pacific decision, which is now attacked by interests antagonistic to the Northern Pacific railway.

Mr. Schurz himself meets the criticisms from all quarters against his official decision. In an article in the Evening Post that he



